

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached three (3) sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 3, 5 and 7B. These three sheets, which include Figures 3, 5, 7A and 7B, replace the original sheets including Figures 2, 5, 7A and 7B. In Figures 3, 5, and 7B, these figures have been labeled PRIOR ART.

Attachments: Three (3) Replacement Sheets
Three (3) Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS

The Examiner has made an election of species restriction in the subject application, indicating that the application contains claims directed toward the following patentably distinct species.

Species A: Figure 1; Species B: Figure 2; Species C: Figure 4; Species D: Figure 6; Species E: Figure 7A; Species F: Figure 8; Species G: Figure 9 and Species H: Figure 10.

In light of this election of species requirement, the Applicant's attorney contacted the Examiner on August 11, 2005, to determine the Examiner's reasoning for the election of species and to understand what affect, if any, the election of one particular species over another would have on the various pending claims. The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to him during this telephone conference. While the undersigned and the Applicant still do not understand the Examiner's reasoning for this election, they respond as follows.

Applicant elects, with traverse, Species F (Figure 8). Claims believed to be readable on Figure 8 include claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 12, 15, 17-19, 22-24, and 26-27. Applicant traverses this election on the basis that, based upon the species presented to the Applicant for election, no claim is presently believed generic. However, given the potential that the Examiner may further restrict the invention set forth in the claims of the present invention, there may eventually be a generic claim that is readable upon the presently identified claims as well as one or more claims not presently identified as being readable on the species elected. Therefore, the Applicant reserves the right to set forth or identify later a generic claim that may include additional dependent claims not presently identified should the Examiner proceed with any further election of species or restriction requirements.


Turning to the objection to the drawings by the Examiner, it is understood that the Examiner believes Figures 3, 5, 7B and 11 should be labeled as PRIOR ART. In accordance with the Examiner's remarks, the Applicant has amended Figures 3, 5 and 7B and labeled them PRIOR ART. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Figure 11 should be labeled PRIOR ART on the basis that that drawing figure shows a

representative form of a screw-type extruding machine suitable for use in the present invention (see second paragraph on Page 10 of the specification).

In light of the foregoing amendments, elections, and arguments, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the application and withdraw his election requirement and his objection to the drawings. A Notice of Allowance of Claims 1-27 is still earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

No fees are presently believed due.


Respectfully submitted,



Rodney L. Skoglund, Reg. No. 36,010
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak,
Taylor & Weber
First National Tower, 4th Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242


Attorney for Applicant
Attorney Docket No. AMC.P.US0021

September 1, 2005




PRIOR ART

Fig. 3



PRIOR ART

Fig. 5



PRIOR ART

Fig. 7A

Fig. 7B